COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL
PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY),
WINCHES FARM,
395, HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

VOLUME 10. Part [illegible] 14th July, 1953
pp. 199—230

29.8.53

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Documents relating to Cases 7 to 16 prepared for consideration at Copenhagen, July-August 1953

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1953

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (6th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 7 (pp. 199–230) 14th July 1953

EDITORIAL NOTE

The present Part contains the documents prepared for consideration at Copenhagen in relation to ten cases. These are those to which the Case Numbers 7 to 16 have been allotted.

2. The first of these papers (numbered Case No. 7) is a Report by the Secretary on the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus the name of which was published, prior to 1st January, 1931, in a generic synonymy without any other indication. This is a subject on which at Paris in 1948 the Secretary was asked to undertake an investigation, in conjunction with interested specialists, and to submit a Report for consideration at Copenhagen in 1953. As explained in the Report now submitted, the subject with which it is concerned is embraced in a wider problem relating to the status generally of *nomina nuda* published in synonymies—whether generic names or trivial names—which was raised by Dr. Ernst Mayr and which forms the subject of Case No. 33 in the present volume. For the reasons explained in the foregoing Report, the whole of the documentation received—both that received in regard to the issue discussed in Paris and also that concerned with the wider issue raised by Dr. Mayr—has been grouped together under Case No. 33.

3. The next eight cases included in the present Part (Cases Nos. 8–15) are all concerned with problems relating to the formation of names and to the conditions in which various classes of very similar names are to be regarded as homonyms of one another. The problems involved are the following :—

Case No. 8. Article 14 : formation of a generic name or a trivial name based upon the name of a modern personage, the first portion of which consists of the particle " M " (Z.N.(S.)484).

Case No. 9. Articles 8 and 14 : choice of connective vowels in the formation of names consisting of compound words (Z.N.(S.)736).

Case No. 10. Article 14, Paragraph (3) Section (c) : method to be followed when forming a trivial name based upon the surname of a Russian woman on the transliteration of that name from the Cyrillic alphabet to the Latin alphabet (Z.N.(S.)266).

in specific synonymies as well as that of generic names similarly published in generic synonymies. Moreover, the question of the availability of names published in this way was called in question by Dr. Mayr, whereas in Paris the view had been taken that generic names published in generic synonymies possessed a status of availability and that the problem to be considered was the procedure to be followed in determining the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which had been published in this way. There was however a clear overlap between Dr. Mayr's proposals on the one hand and, on the other hand, the more limited problem which had been referred to me for investigation.

3. On receipt of Dr. Mayr's proposal, I came to the conclusion that the correct course at that stage was to treat these two problems as distinct subjects and to pursue the task which had been entrusted to me by the Paris Congress. Accordingly, towards the close of 1951, I prepared a survey of the problems involved in the subject which had been referred to me by the Paris Congress, but in doing so, I drew attention to the proposal which had been submitted by Dr. Mayr, in order thereby to elicit comments on that proposal as well as on the narrower question with which I was then immediately concerned. The survey so prepared was published (together with similar surveys on the other problems which had been referred to me by the Paris Congress) in March (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 109–118). In addition, I took the steps described in the Introductory Note to volume 8 of the present serial publication (1953, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **8** : 2–3) to bring to the attention of zoologists and palaeontologists the present, and the other six, problems on which in Paris in 1948 I had been asked, as Secretary to the International Commission, to confer with interested specialists and, having done so, to prepare Reports for consideration at Copenhagen in 1953. Both in the surveys published in volume 7 of the *Bulletin* and in the communications later issued through the scientific press and also individually to Nomenclature Committees, I appealed to all interested workers to furnish statements setting out their views as to the action which it was desirable should be taken by the Copenhagen Congress.

4. In the course of 1952 I received a large number of statements in regard to the present subject. The majority of these dealt in varying degrees of fullness with the wider issues raised by Dr. Mayr. In a few cases only did the statements received deal with the limited question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy. Of those workers who did touch on this subject, almost all were of the opinion that, if generic names published in this way were to be accepted, the genus, the name of which was published in synonymy must be regarded as identical with the genus, in the synonymy of the name of which it was published. In other words, the view was taken that a genus, the name of which was published in this way must have as its type species the same species as the genus, with the name of which the name of the new genus was synonymised at the time of its first publication. One correspondent, however, took the view that in a case of this kind the species to be accepted

as the type species should be whatever species was selected as such by the first reviser. Another suggested that such names might be dealt with as substitute names under Rule (f) in Article 30. A number of correspondents drew attention to the fact that there was an essential difference between (1) a generic name published without an indication in a generic synonymy and (2) a generic name which, though treated, at the time of its first publication, as a synonym of some other generic name was nevertheless on that occasion accompanied by a generic diagnosis or other " indication " prepared by the author by whom the name had first been used in manuscript.

5. After reviewing the entire documentation received, I have come to the conclusion that the two problems—that is, the narrow Paris problem and the wider Mayr problem—are so closely related to one another that the most convenient course will be to treat these two questions as forming part of a single subject. For, if at Copenhagen the general feeling is in favour of Dr. Mayr's thesis, the question raised at Paris will cease to be a practical issue, since generic names published in generic synonymies will be declared to possess no status of availability. No useful discussion of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was published in a generic synonymy could therefore usefully be undertaken until a conclusion has been reached on the broader issue raised by Dr. Mayr. It is evident, however, from the particulars given in paragraph 4 above that, if generic names of the class with which the present Report is concerned, were to be accepted as available names, there is substantial agreement as to how the type species of such a genus should be determined.

6. In these circumstances, I have grouped the whole of the material in a single series as forming the documentation submitted in relation to a single case. The Case so established has been allotted the Case No. 33. This case, being concerned mainly with the availability of a certain class of name has been placed with the other proposals which have been received in relation to Article 25. In view of the mandate given to me by the Paris Congress to investigate the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy, I have felt it necessary however to make the present brief Report on the action which I have taken to discharge the duty entrusted to me in 1948.

PART 2

PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE TEXT OF THE " RÈGLES ", OTHER THAN THE SEVEN PROBLEMS ON WHICH THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY CALLED FOR SPECIAL REPORTS FOR SUBMISSION TO THE FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY AT COPENHAGEN IN 1953

CASE NO. 8

ARTICLE 14 : FORMATION OF A GENERIC NAME OR A TRIVIAL NAME BASED UPON THE NAME OF A MODERN PERSONAGE, THE FIRST PORTION OF WHICH CONSISTS OF THE PARTICLE " M "

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)484)

DOCUMENT 8/1

By **G. H. E. HOPKINS**, O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum (Natural History), The Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

Letter dated 27th September, 1950

The Commission has dealt (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 206, 207, 208) with the question of Mac, Mc and O', but M' (which logically should be dealt with in the same way as O') is not mentioned. It is a rare form, but one occasionally comes across it. In the London Telephone Directory for Oct. 1949, volume L-R, you will find M'Cardell (p. 3194) and M'Lachlan (p. 3221).

DOCUMENT 8/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(1) Letter, dated 3rd October, 1950, to Mr. G. H. E. Hopkins

Mac, Mc, and M' names (*Z.N.*(*S.*) 484)

I entirely agree with you that " M' " names ought to have been dealt with at the same time as " Mac " and " Mc " names. I agree further that the logical course would be to treat these names in the same way as " O' " names. It will however be necessary also for all three of the names shown in the above heading to ensure that for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy these variations are to be ignored. You will have noted that this was done as regards " Mac " and " Mc " names (see Point (4) on page 208 of vol. 4 of *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*).

I think that the best thing will be for me to take up this point with the zoologist who put forward the original proposal and to suggest to him that he should put in a supplementary proposal to deal with the point which you have raised, and which I am very grateful to you for having brought to attention.

(2) Letter dated 31st October, 1950, to Professor Pierre Bonnet (University of Toulouse)

You will recall that at the Paris Congress, it was agreed, in response to a proposition submitted by yourself, to add provisions to Article 14 prescribing the correct method of forming a trivial name based on a surname commencing with " Mac ", " Mc " or " O' " (paragraph (1) (e) of Conclusion 11 of 7th Meeting, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 206—207), and also to add to Article 35 (or rather to the Article which is to replace Article 35) a provision stating that two trivial names based on surnames that differ only in that in the one case it commences with " Mac ", and in the other with " Mc " are to be regarded as identical for purposes of the Law of Homonymy (para. (4) of the above-mentioned Conclusion, *loc. cit.*: 208).

I have now received a latter from Mr. G. H. E. Hopkins (of the British Museum (Natural History)) drawing attention to the somewhat rarer case, which nevertheless does turn up from time to time, of names commencing with " M' ", which should also be dealt with under the new provisions.

I would like to suggest that you might submit a proposal supplementary to those which you submitted, and which were agreed, at the Paris Congress, suggesting that trivial names based on surnames beginning with " M' " (*e.g.*, M'Cardell, M'Lachlan) should be formed analogously to those based on names beginning with " O' " (para. (1) (e) of Conclusion 11) and that trivial names based on names beginning " M' " should be regarded as identical, for purposes of the Law of Homonymy, with trivial names based on surnames differing from the latter only by the fact that they begin with " Mac " or " Mc " instead of " M' ". (Para. (4) of the same Conclusion.)

DOCUMENT 8/3

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Letter dated 8th November, 1950

Bien recu votre lettre du 31 octobre, à laquelle je réponds sans retard.

Il n'a a pas de doute que les noms spécifiques commençant par *M'* (*M'Cardell, M'Lachlan*) rentrent dans la même catégorie que ceux qui commencent par *Mac* on *Mc*. C'est d'ailleurs un oubli de ma part si je ne l'ai pas mis dans la remarque de ma proposition 5, car dans mon travail original ou j'ai traité la question; j'avais ecrit: " *Pour les noms avec la particule Mac,* les abreviations Mc et *M' doivent toujours être retablies en entier : MacCook, McCook, M'Cook doivent tous les trois donner le même nom spécifique que l'on ecrira toujours maccooki* ".

Vous pouvez donc rédiger une proposition additive a la Conclusion 11, parag. 4, disant que " *les noms spécifiques formés des noms de personnes commencant par M' (comme M'Cook, M'Lachlan) sont, selon l'article* 35, *homonymes de ceux commencant par Mac on Mc (maccooki = mccooki = m'cooki) ; de ce fait, pour l'avenir, il y a lieu d'uniformiser l'écriture de ces termes en écrivant les prefixes Mc on M' en entier : maccooki, maclachlani* ".

Je pense qu'ainsi cela est tres clair et pourra convenir.

DOCUMENT 8/4

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

SUPPLEMENTARY PROPOSAL TO APPLY TO GENERIC NAMES, FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY, THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET IN RESPECT OF TRIVIAL NAMES

As noted in Document 8/1 the Paris Congress dealt with the position, under the Law of Homonymy, of trivial names commencing with such particles as " Mac " and " Mc " and the proposals now submitted in Document 8/3 fills in an omission as regards trivial names commencing with the particle " M ". In Paris the decisions then taken in regard to trivial names commencing with the particles " Mac ", " Mc " and " O' " were applied also to generic names of this type (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 208), but by an inadvertence this was not done for names commencing with the particle " O' ". It is suggested that this should now for this class of name and also for names commencing with the particle " M " dealt with, so far as trivial names are concerned, in Professor Bonnet's present application. (Document 8/3.)

CASE NO. 9

ARTICLES 8 AND 14 : CHOICE OF CONNECTIVE VOWELS IN THE FORMATION OF NAMES CONSISTING OF COMPOUND WORDS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)736)

DOCUMENT 9/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse*)

(Communicated by Professor H. BOSCHMA (Leiden) under cover of a letter dated 8th August, 1951)

PROPOSITION D'UNE RÈGLEMENTATION POUR LA FORMATION DES TERMES SCIENTIFIQUES COMPOSÈS DE DEUX MOTS (CHOIX DE LA VOYELLE DE LIAISON)

L'étude de plusieurs centaines de mots scientifiques composés permet à l'auteur d'établir une réglementation concernant la formation correcte de ces termes ; toutes les modalités possibles ont été etudiées.

(1e) termes formés d'un adjectif précédé d'un préfixe invariable (*subaequalis*, *bimaculatus*, *polydactylus*) avec des remarques sur la suppression de l'hiatus (*monoculus*, *quadrangulatus*) ou son maintien (*bioculatus*, *triangulifer*).

(2e) termes formés soit de deux adjectifs, soit d'un substantif et d'un adjectif, soit d'un substantif et d'un verbe devenu adjectif verbal avec choix de la voyelle de liaison : *o* pour les racines grecques (*erythrocephalus*, *melanognatha*, *hydrophilus*), *i* pour les racines latines (*albimaculatus*, *nigriventris*, *lucifuga*). Remarques sur certaines exceptions (*galloprovincialis*, *fuscorufus*, *aurocinctus*) et sur la suppression de l'hiatus (*melanodontus*, *fulvaster*).

(3e) termes formés de deux substantifs (*tauricornu*, *densleonis*, *aviuminsulae*) dont le deuxième peut-être adjectivé (*anguicomus*, *a*, *um* ; *fronticornis*, *e* ; *formiciformis e*) (et non *formicaeformis*).

Ces règles sont accompagnées :

(1e) de remarques générals concernant les mots hybrides à éviter (*nigrocephalus*, *isopeda*) et l'utilisation du radical des mots pris au génitif (et non au nominatif, souvent irrégulier) pour la formation des termes composés (*nigritarsis* et non *nigeritarsis*, *Gastropoda* et non *Gasteropoda*, *Octopodidae* et non *Octopidae*).

(2e) une réglementation pratique concernant les termes mal formés déjà existants ; (a) ne pas les employer quand le terme correct coexiste et est aussi utilisé pour désigner un animal (*albimaculatus*, *albomaculatus* : *Gastropoda*, *Gasteropoda*) ; (b) les rectifier, s'ils n'ont été employés qui un petit nombre de fois ; (c) les maintenir, si un long usage, a, en quelque sorte, régularisé leur incorrection (comme automobile, en français ; comme *Lycosa albofasciata*, nommée ainsi deux à trois cents fois).

DOCUMENT 9/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In connection with the foregoing paper by Professor Pierre Bonnet, it should be noted that in my survey of the problems involved in the emendation of names (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 4–59) I drew attention (in paragraph 53) to the situation which arises when incorrect connective vowels are used in the formation of names consisting of compound words. Some comments on this subject will be found in the documents received in response to the appeal then made to specialists for advice on the question of the extent to which it is desirable that names should be emended or, on the other hand, should be allowed to stand in the incorrect form in which they were published. Reference should therefore be made to the documents published in the present volume under the Case No. 5.

2. Attention is drawn also to the proposals on this subject submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet with other proposals in his Proposition 8. This proposal was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 185–187) and is reprinted in the present volume as Document 17/1.

3. In this, as in other problems arising in connection with the emendation of names, there are potentially two questions involved. Of these the main question—from the logical point of view—is whether names consisting of erroneously spelt words of certain specified types are to be emended. If in any given case this main question is answered in the negative, an important second question arises, namely, whether two trivial names, of which one is correctly spelt and the other incorrectly spelt, are to be regarded as homonyms of one another. The following are examples drawn from Professor Bonnet's paper (Document 9/1) : *melanognatha* (correct) and *melanignatha* (incorrect) ; *formiciformis* (correct) and *formicaeformis* (incorrect). On this question attention is drawn to document 5/18 (:85), where Dr. J. Marvin Weller suggests that the provisions relating to the Law of Homonymy should be expanded so as to bring spelling variations of this kind within its scope. I entirely agree with Dr. Marvin Weller in this matter, for it would seem to me to be repugnant to common sense and quite intolerable to permit the co-existence within a single genus of two such specific trivial names as *formiciformis* and *formicaeformis*.

CASE NO. 10

ARTICLE 14, PARAGRAPH (3), SECTION (C) : METHOD TO BE FOLLOWED WHEN FORMING A TRIVIAL NAME BASED UPON THE SURNAME OF A RUSSIAN WOMAN ON THE TRANSLITERATION OF THAT NAME FROM THE CYRILLIC ALPHABET TO THE LATIN ALPHABET

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)266)

DOCUMENT 10/1

By **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY**

(*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

Extract from a letter dated 18th September, 1946

Editorial Note : I discussed this question with Dr. Dougherty when he came to see me in August 1948, and he then added the following note to the File : " This point should be considered in relation to the suggestion by Bonnet in regard to the same question. I agree with Bonnet ". The paper by Professor Bonnet here referred to is his Proposition 5, consideration of which was deferred by the International Commission at its Session held in Paris in 1948. For an extract of the relevant portion of Professor Bonnet's proposal, see Document 10/2 (initialled) F.H. 28th May, 1953.

. . . . . .

In dealing with Article 14, point (c), I have been perplexed as to the manner of interpretation of part of the sentence dealing with modern patronymics. Paragraph 3, part c, begins as follows : " If the name is a modern patronymic, the genitive is always formed by adding to the exact and complete name, an *i* if the person is a man, or an *ae* if the person is a woman, even if the name has a Latin form . . . " Now procedure as regards the male patronymic is clear to me, but certain female patronymics offer difficulty. Let us suppose that a woman's surname ends in an *a*—e.g., Andreeva or Andreewa (from the Russian Андреева; according to a strict reading of the quoted sentence the trivial name formed from this patronymic should be *andreevaae* or *andreewaae*. But is such really meant by Article 14 ? Would not *andreevae* or *andreewae* be more logical—in other words adding of an *e* rather than *ae* to feminine patronymics already ending in *a* ? This Russian name brings up a further problem. A number of recent Soviet systematists—apparently perplexed by the problem already outlined—have solved it neatly, but, I presume, illegally, simply by using the *Russian* genitive in transliteration. The Russian genitive of Андреева Андреевой—Andreevoi or Andreewoi in transliteration. There is for example a nematode species *Kutassicaulus* (or *Otostrongylus*) *andreewoi*. Must the trivial name in this case be emended, and, if so, should it become *andreewaae*, or *andreewae* ?

DOCUMENT 10/2

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse*)

EXTRACT FROM PROPOSITION 5 SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AT PARIS IN 1948

(Note : The above application was published in full in 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 181—162.)

(2) Si ce sont des personnes portant un nom moderne ou un prénom comme patronymique, le génitif est toujours formé par l'addition, (au nom exact et complet de la personne, écrit normalement dans sa langue, avec ses accents) d'un *i* quand cette personne est un homme, de *ae* quand c'est une dame, *orum* quand il s'agit d'un ménage ou de deux freres, *arum* s'il s'agit de deux soeurs :

.....

..... *racovitzae*‡, ...

‡ Quand le nom d'une dame se termine par " e ", on change le " a " en " ae " ; *racovitzae* non *racovitzaae*.

CASE NO. 11

ARTICLE 14: PROBLEM ARISING IN CONNECTION WITH TRIVIAL NAMES BASED UPON MODERN PATRONYMICS IN CASES WHERE THOSE PATRONYMICS ARE IN A LATINISED FORM

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)737)

DOCUMENT 11/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

At Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature considered a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet in regard to the formation of certain trivial names based upon the patronymics of modern personages when those patronymics are themselves in Latinised form. Professor Bonnet's proposal (his " Proposition 5 ") was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3: 181–182).

2. The proposal then adopted by the International Commission and approved by the International Congress was (a) that the normal rule should apply in such cases (i.e., that such trivial names, when formed in the genitive case, should consist of the complete (Latinised) patronymic of the person concerned, to which should be added the appropriate genitival ending), but (b) that exceptions should be permitted in certain specified cases, the procedure in such cases to be that the Latinised modern patronymic should be treated as though it were a Latin word and should be declined accordingly.

3. The exceptions thus agreed upon were the following three, namely trivial names based upon the names of (a) Linnaeus, (b) Fabricius, and (c) Poda. Accordingly, the correct form for trivial names based upon the patronymics of the foregoing zoologists are: *linnaei* (not *linnaeusi*); *fabricii* (not *fabriciusi*); *podae* (not *podai*) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 206).

4. In the discussion leading up to the foregoing decision the view was expressed that " It was likely that experience would show the need for adding to the list of exceptions in this matter " (see 1950, *ibid.* 4: 204, Point (iv)). This question is accordingly re-submitted for consideration in order to provide an opportunity of adding, should this be desired, to the list of exceptions agreed upon in 1948.

5. In the period which has elapsed since the Paris Session, only one case has been submitted as possibly qualifying as an exception. This case, which was brought forward by Mr. D. K. McE. Kevan (*University of Nottingham*), relates to the formation to be adopted in forming trivial names based upon the name of the Swedish entomologist C. V. S. Aurivillius. At present under Article 14, a trivial name based upon the name of this worker can be correctly formed only as " aurivilliusi "; it appears however that in the majority of cases the form " *aurivillii* " has been adopted and is in use.

CASE NO. 12

ARTICLE 14 : QUESTION OF THE FORMATION OF A TRIVIAL NAME BASED UPON A MODERN PATRONYMIC IN CASES WHERE THAT PATRONYMIC CONSISTS OF MORE THAN TWO WORDS, OF WHICH THE FIRST IS THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)503)

Editorial Note : The above problem was initially raised (in a letter dated 28th November, 1950) by Dr. Reeve M. Bailey (*University of Michigan Ann Arbor.*). Eventually it was decided to ask the Nomenclature Committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, of which Dr. Bailey is a member, to consider this question and to submit its views to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. The concluding portion of the correspondence relating to this problem was therefore conducted with Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman of the above Committee. (Initialled) F.H. 31st May, 1953.

DOCUMENT 12/1

Explanatory Note by **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Extract from a letter dated 5th July, 1951, to Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman, Nomenclature Committee, American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists

Preliminary consideration was given to this general question by the Commission at its meeting in 1948 when it was agreed that in view of the complexity of the issue and the desirability of ascertaining what was the practice (or majority practice) in various groups, the question should be deferred for further consideration (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 207–212). The principal points which call for decision appear to be :—

(1) What shall be the general rule for the formation of trivial names (and generic names) of the type in question [i.e., for trivial names based upon modern names such as " Lacépède "] ?

(2) Is such a trivial or generic name, when incorrectly formed, to be subject to automatic correction ?

(3) If not, what is to be the position as regards the Law of Homonymy ? That is, in that event, should the Code permit the use within the same genus both of the trivial name *lacepedei* and of the name *cepedei* ?

(4) If the answer to (2) above is " yes ", should provision be made for the granting of exceptions for the purpose of avoiding the alteration of an incorrectly formed name published prior to the introduction of rule may be decided upon in cases where an incorrectly formed name has acquired general currency ?

DOCUMENT 12/2

Statement furnished by the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ICHTHYOLOGISTS AND HERPETOLOGISTS**

Letter dated 17th April, 1952, from Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

Trivial names of the lacepedei/cepedei type

The American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, Committee on Zoological Nomenclature, has voted unanimously in favour of the following principles :

(1) That no general rule for the formation of trivial names (or generic names) of the type in question is desired.

(2) That such a trivial or generic name. when incorrectly formed, is not to be subject to automatic correction.

(3) That the Code should permit the use within the same genus both of the trivial name *lacepedei* and of the name *cepedei*.

(4) That the answer to (2) above being in the negative, no answer to your fourth question is indicated.

Excerpts from the correspondence of all committee members are the following :

Dr. Charles M. Bogert (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York City*) : " I seriously doubt whether any general rule could be set up for the formation of trivial or generic names of the type in question ".

Mr. W. I. Follett (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco*) : " My own thought on this matter is that the original orthography affords the only criterion that is wholly objective ".

Dr. Arnold B. Grobman (*University of Florida, Gainesville*) : " I do not think it wise to treat patronymics any differently than names of descriptive, geographical, or nonsense-syllable origin. All trivial names, including patronymics, should stand as originally proposed (except in obvious cases of a printer's error, etc.) ".

Dr. Robert Rush Miller (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.*) : " For this specific example given above, I looked into the matter of whether one could really reach a clear-cut, objective decision on how to properly spell this patronymic. My conclusion is that this cannot be done, not only because the gentleman in question spelled his name La Cépède or Lacépède at various times (and hence the patronymic could properly have been formed *cepedei* or *lacepedei*) but, worse yet, this was not really the man's name at all but merely a title bestowed upon him (Comte de Lacépède). If in such an isolated case as this no reasonable solution presents itself, I should think that other examples

would bring up similar difficulties and that no general rule could possibly cover all cases. I therefore conclude that . . . retention of the original orthography is the only objective solution in such cases (La Cépède, de Buen, de la Roche, etc.) ".

Dr. George S. Myers (*Stanford University, California*) (then President of the ASIH, and as such, *ex-officio* member of the Committee) : " For whatever effect it may have upon the recommendations of the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, I wish to protest strongly against any existing or future rule that requires changing the spelling of an already published generic or trivial name for any reason save a printer's error in the name at the original place of proposal. The new section of the *Règles* which allows corrections of spelling on philological and perhaps other grounds will cause a great deal of trouble in producing unnecessary homonyms in generic names, and I am hoping that this section may be repealed or eliminated. Moreover, I can see no good reason to disturb trivial patronymics because different namers have spelt the name of the person ' honored ' differently. Some of the persons so honored have not themselves been consistent in spelling their own names, and the safest rule for the zoologist is to follow the originally proposed spelling of a name ".

Dr. Hobart M. Smith (*University of Illinois, Urbana*) : " Obviously a decision regarding French will be a stepping stone to decisions on Spanish and, more confusingly, to Dutch and other names (as for example Van der Hoeven, Van Denburgh, etc.). Taxonomists should not be expected to be critics of what part or parts of the surnominal article are to be accepted, and which rejected, or even whether they should *always* be either accepted or rejected ".

Mr. Norman J. Wilimovsky (*Stanford University, California*) : " I wish to make it clear in the beginning that I definitely oppose any form of correction with names of the *lacepedei/cepedi* types. I base my objection on a number of reasons, perhaps the strongest being that any trivial name can be considered nothing more than a combination of letters. If we start digging back into older works to begin correcting names I'm afraid that more confusion will result than stability. With regard to patronymics I feel the author should decide on just how it is to be formed ".

Excerpts from letters received from all specialists who replied to the Committee's request for advice are the following :

Dr. Reeve M. Bailey (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.*) : " I personally have no strong feelings on the subject, so will be glad of any clear-cut decision . . . My preference is for emendation—thus, we could remember merely the simple manner of formation of genitive patronymics and know how to spell any name of this character. The only difficulty for me is knowing what is (or is not) part of the name—we could call it the de la Roche dilemma (*delarochei, larochei* or *rochei* ?) ".

Dr. Carl L. Hubbs (*University of California, La Jolla*) : " I have your copies of correspondence regarding what action should be taken in respect to names of the *lacepedei/cepedei* type. It seems to me that this argument over such a really ' trivial ' case is a very strong argument for not tampering with the rule of following the original spelling, right or wrong . . . In any event, in this special case I think we should very strongly urge that the older names be not changed except under very simple and understandable conditions. Perhaps a rule could be made obligatory for the future, but I do not think it should be for the past. The question of whether or not the article in the family name should be used or deleted is certainly a complicated one. The degree to which the article is or is not a part of the name varies greatly in different languages, at different times, and no doubt for different families. Just why we cannot allow the author of a name to decide questions of this sort is beyond me. I feel sure that in this special case we will run into a whole string of new complexities if we do not follow the principle of complying with the original spelling. Otherwise we will have the problem of deciding whether or not the man involved usually did or did not use the article with his name, whether the article was capitalised, whether the article was combined with the rest of the name, etc. . . . Another very major difficulty will be in deciding often for whom a species was named, and how that presumed person spelled his name. Probably a majority of authors do not actually indicate the etymology of their specific names ".

Mr. John Treadwell Nichols (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York City*) : " I have had names ' corrected ' by an editor, and of course followed them as published, but it was annoying, as they did not so well serve my purpose or intention . . . Where two names are different they are rated as different by me, except where one might be made by legitimate change of gender, or proved misprint—that they may mean the same thing and one might be ' corrected ' into the other on the basis of someone's whim or opinion has nothing to do with it ".

Dr. Leonard P. Schultz (*United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.*) : " It seems to me that the problem is solvable under the already existing rules of zoological nomenclature. Since we have been using for over fifty years the exact spelling originally used, I would prefer to follow that system and make no rule that would accept any special spelling ".

CASE NO. 13

ARTICLE 14: PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED WHEN FORMING A TRIVIAL NAME BASED EITHER (1) UPON THE NAME OF A MODERN PERSONAGE WHERE THAT NAME IS PRECEDED BY A NOBILIAR PARTICLE OR (2) UPON THE NAME OF A CHRISTIAN SAINT

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)740)

DOCUMENT 13/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

It will be remembered that at Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration a composite proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse*) dealing with a considerable number of points arising in connection with the formation of trivial names (Article 14). This proposal, to which Professor Bonnet had given the title " Proposition 5 " was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 181–182).

2. Decisions were reached on all the matters raised in Professor Bonnet's Proposition 5 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 200–209).

3. This question is however raised again here, in order to provide an opportunity for considering whether it is desirable that a qualifying *Recommandation* should be added in the case of two of the matters then dealt with. These are the procedures to be followed in forming a trivial name based either (i) upon the name of a modern personage, where that name is preceded by a nobiliar particle or (ii) upon the name of a Christian Saint. For in each available material suggests that, in the absence of a warning of this kind, an author forming trivial names of the foregoing types is liable to fall into error.

4. As regards the first of the foregoing types of trivial name, it was decided that the nobiliar particle should be omitted, the correct form for a trivial name based upon the name of a man bearing the name " de Lessert " being *lessrti* not *delessrti* (see 1950, *ibid.* **4**: 207–208, Point (3) (a)). In the case of trivial names based upon the names of Christian Saints it was decided that the adjective " Sanctus " or its equivalent should be omitted, the correct form of a trivial name based (for example) upon the name of St. Remy being thus *remyi* not *sanctiremyi* (see 1950, *ibid.* **4**: 207, Point (2) (c)).

5. The difficulty which is now seen to arise is how in certain cases to determine, in the first case, whether, where the name of a modern personage consists of two or more words, the first part is, in fact, a nobiliar particle, and,

in the second case, whether a given particle has the meaning that the person, to whose name that particle is attached, was a Christian Saint. Examples of these difficulties are provided in the notes furnished (a) by the late Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Document 13/2) and by Senor Angel Cabrera (Document 13/3).

6. In view of the evident difficulties involved in forming names of these two classes, it is suggested for consideration that it might be advantageous to replace the Paris provisions with the following new provisions :—

(1) *New provision :* Where it is desired to base a trivial name upon a patronymic which consists of two words, of which the first (1) may be a nobiliar particle, or (2) may indicate that the name is that of a Christian Saint, the particle may be either included in, or excluded from, the trivial name so formed.

(2) Suggested new " Recommandation " : Where it is clear in such a case that the first word of the patronymic concerned (i) is a nobiliar particle or (ii) is intended to denote that the person concerned has been canonised as a Christian Saint, it is recommended that the particle should be omitted.

DOCUMENT 13/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

PROPOSAL 5 OF PROF. BONNET (PROPOSAL TO MODIFY PARAGRAPH C OF ART. 14 GIVING MORE DETAILED RULES ON THE WAY TO FORM TRIVIAL NAMES DEDICATED TO ONE OR MORE PERSONS

I agree, for sake of uniformity, with the first paragraphs of proposal 5, concerning the way of forming the genitive form. With proposal 5, 3° telling that " in the names having a separable nobiliar particule (de, du, del, di, do, van, von etc.) this must be abolished " I cannot agree, because it is almost impossible to know when a separate particule is a nobiliar particule and when it is an integral part of the name. In Italy for instance, there exist familiar names like Di Vestea, D'Onofrio, which are quite different names from the, top existing, family names Vestea, Onofrio ; in such cases, it is a real mistake to supprime the particule. On the other hand, if it is possible for me, being an Italian, to know whether a particule is a nobiliar (and therefore supprimable) one or one, which is an integral part of the name, in Italian names, it is impossible for me to know that in the other languages, and such is the case for every

one. The best proof of it is given by Prof. Bonnet himself, because in the list of examples which he gives, there is a mistake : Bonnet tells that a trivial name dedicated to Del Pino must be *pinoi* : but, the particule Del of Del Pino is not a nobiliar particule ; it is an integral part of the name and to call a species *pinoi* after Del Pino would be exactly the same mistake as to call species *neti* from Bonnet.

The same must be said for the names compound with San, Saint etc. (prop 5,5° of Prof. Bonnet). San Marzano is a quite different family name from Marzano and so forth.

I think it impossible to give a rule valuable in each case ; moreover, it seems to me that it is a thing of little value if someone dedicates a species of a genus a to de Lessert and calls it *delesserti* and another author dedicates a species of another genus to de Lessert calling it *lesserti* ; the important thing is that species *A. delesserti*, once named so, must always be called *delessarti* and not *lesserti* and not become *delesserti*.

At any rate, I think that it is well to prescribe explicitly that the names with a separable particule or the names with San, Saint etc. fall under the rule of proposal 7 of Prof. Bonnet and must be written in a single word.

DOCUMENT 13/3

COMMENT ON POINT (5) IN PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET'S PROPOSITION 5

By **ANGEL CABRERA** (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*)

Extract from a letter dated 26th June, 1952

Please find herewith a rectification of a little slip of a linguistic character in a proposed clarification of the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the formation of names.

Annexe Dr. Angel Cabrera's letter

A PROPOSED RECTIFICATION

In *Bull. Z. N.*, **3** : 182 (Proposed clarification of Article 14 of the *Règles*) it is said, paragr. 5 :

" Corrélativement, tous les noms composés avec Saint, Sainte, Sanct, San, etc. no doivent pas voir de préfixe figurer dans leur nom : SAINT REMY : *rémyi*. SANZ DE DIEGO : *diegoi*.

The last example involves a mistake. The Spanish word " Sanz " is not a prefix similar to Saint, Sainte, etc. It is a family name by itself, like Saez, Saenz or Sanchez, without a meaning of sanctity. Sanz de Diego is a combination of two names, similar to the French " Gadeau de Kerville " or to the Spanish " Jiménez de la Espada ". A species named after Sanz de Diego may be either *sanzi* or *diegoi*.

CASE No. 14

ARTICLE 14 : PROPOSED REGULARISATION OF THE STATUS OF TRIVIAL NAMES BASED ON MODERN PATRONYMICS, WHEN FORMED AS ADJECTIVES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)661)

DOCUMENT 14/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The present wording of the portion (paragraph (3)) of Article 14 which relates to the formation of trivial names when based upon modern patronymics is ambiguous, in that it implies—or appears to imply—that, where a trivial name is based upon a modern patronymic, the only permissible way in which to form that name is to add the appropriate genitival ending to the complete name of the person (or persons) after whom the species in question is named. It is quite clear, however, that this cannot have been the intention of the draftsman of this part of Article 14, in view of the large number of trivial names based upon modern patronymics which have been formed not as noun substantives in the genitive case (such as *smithi*) but as adjectives (such as *smithianus*).

2. This ambiguity has been brought to my attention by a number of correspondents and is one which, I suggest, should be rectified. The proposal now submitted is :—

(1) that Article 14 should be amended to provide that a trivial name may be based upon the name of a modern personage, either (i) as a noun in the genitive case or (ii) as an adjective ;

(2) that a *Recommandation* should be added in favour of the formation of such names as nouns rather than as adjectives ;

The foregoing provisions would then be followed by the provision regarding the form of genitive endings for such nouns which was substituted for the former paragraph (3) of this Article at Paris in 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 205–206, Point (1) (b)).

3. It will be recalled that in his note on the question of emending names, which has been included in the present volume (:89) as Document 5/15, Mr. C. W. Wright suggested that the *Règles* should be clarified in the sense suggested above.

CASE NO. 15

ARTICLE 14 : QUESTION WHETHER IT IS DESIRABLE THAT TRIVIAL NAMES BASED UPON MODERN PATRONYMICS IN THE GENITIVE SINGULAR AND INCORRECTLY FORMED WITH A TERMINAL DOUBLE " II " SHOULD, AS DECIDED IN PARIS IN 1948, BE SUBJECT TO AUTOMATIC CORRECTION

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)705)

DOCUMENT 15/1

Introductory Note by **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

At its meeting held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature recommended, and the Thirteenth International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature agreed, that, where a trivial name based upon a modern patronymic is formed in the genitive singular and, notwithstanding the explicit provisions of Article 14 (third paragraph) a double " -ii " instead of a single " -i " is added to the name of the person in whose honour the species is named, this contravention of the foregoing provision shall be subject to automatic correction (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 67–68). At the same time the International Commission cancelled as incorrect its *Opinion* 8 in which an opposite view had been taken.

2. Since 1948 the Paris ruling has been applied in all cases submitted to the International Commission. As regards one of these, however, an objection to the foregoing ruling has been received. The case in question is one submitted by Dr. C. J. Stubblefield and is concerned with the proposed use of the plenary powers to vary the type species of the trilobite genus *Cummingella* Reed, 1842 (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)409); the species which it was there proposed should be designated as the type species was originally published as *Phillipsia jonesii* (by Portlock in 1843). In commenting on this application, Professor Rudolf Richter indicated his support of the action proposed but took strong objection to the correction of the trivial name from *jonesii* to *jonesi*.

3. Professor Richter's communication is annexed as Document 15/2. It is not possible to accept as valid Professor Richter's argument that the provision discussed above should be regarded as optional in character, for, if this had been so, it would have been incorporated in the *Règles* as a *Recommandation* and not as part of the mandatory provisions. Nevertheless, careful consideration needs to be given to what is, in effect, Professor Richter's main

contention, namely that, having regard to the long use of many trivial names incorrectly formed with a terminal double " -ii ", it would be contrary to the interests of stability to require that all names incorrectly formed in this way should be corrected, so as to comply with the requirements of Article 14.

4. If the foregoing view were to be taken and it was accordingly decided to review the decision taken in Paris on this subject, the following questions would call for decision :—

(1) If names incorrectly formed with a terminal double " -ii " are to be exempt from automatic correction, if published before a certain date, what date should be fixed for this purpose ? Should it be (say) 1st January, 1950, the nearest convenient date to that on which the Paris decision was published or the date of the Copenhagen Congress or some date subsequent thereto ?

(2) Since the object of modifying the Paris decision in this matter would be the promotion of stability in nomenclature, what safeguards should be introduced to prevent the suggested change from having the exactly opposite effect in those cases where the currently accepted form for a given trivial name is not the incorrect form with a terminal double " -ii " in which it was originally published but the corrected form with a single terminal " -i " ?

(3) If in the interests of stability the trivial names based on modern patronymics originally published incorrectly with a terminal double " -ii " are not be to subject to correction, if published before a certain date, what action, if any, is it desirable should be taken in the parallel case where a name of the foregoing type is incorrectly formed by reason of the fact that the patronymic in question is not embodied unchanged in the trivial name based upon it ? An example of a name of this class is provided by the name *Phillipsia kellii* Portlock, 1843, a name which purports to have been given in honour of a man named Kelly ; this name is chosen as an example because it happens to occur in the same application by Dr. Stubblefield as that referred to by Professor Richter in Document 15/2. If this aspect of Article 14 is to be dealt with, the questions raised in (1) and (2) above will each call for consideration in connection with it.

DOCUMENT 15/2

By **RUDOLF RICHTER** (*Senckenbergische Naturforschende Gesellschaft, Senckenberg Anlage, Frankfurt a.M.*)

Memorandum dated 5th September, 1952

STELLUNGNAHME ZU DEN VORSCHLAGEN VON DR. C. J. STUBBLEFIELD (Z.N.(S.)409) IN BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCLATURE, 6, 5 : 150 LONDON, 15 APRIL, 1952

Die Vorschläge sind gut begründet und zweckmässig. Ihre Annahme wird einen Fortschritt im Sinne der Stabilität der Nomenklatur bedeuten.

Nur die *Schreibweise* der Art-Namen erfordert eine Bemerkung.

Die Art jonesii 1843 wird in dem Antrag jonesi geschrieben. Das ist im strengen Sinne nicht korrekt, da der Artikel 14 IZRN, der die Endung -i statt -ii vorschreibt, erst für solche Namen gilt, die *nach* 1905 aufgestellt werden. Denn auch in der Nomenklatur sind *rückwirkende Gesetze immer illegal.* Es entstehen jedoch in diesem Falle keine schädlichen Folgen für die Nomenklatur, da nach den Gutachten zu Artikel 14 die Endungen -i und -ii zu den *fakultativen Varianten* gehören, die man ohne nomenklatorische Folgen *nebeneinander* gebrauchen darf.

Dagegen ist die nachträgliche Anderung des Art-Namens kellii PORTLOCK 1843 in kellyi abzulehnen, obwohl nach Artikel 34, 35 IZRN auch hierdurch nur fakultative Varianten entstehen. Aber die Duldung einer solchen Anderung wurde schädliche Folgen für die Stabilität der Nomenklatur haben. Denn wenn man PORTLOCK nachträglich das Recht abspricht, den Paten-Namen KELLY in KELLIUS zu latinisieren und von KELLIUS den Art-Namen kellii (statt kellyi) zu bilden, so muss das logischer Weise auch in vielen anderen Fällen tun. Man kommt dann ohne Grenze zu immer schwereren Anderungen : So hat z.B. DE KONINCK 1841 den Paten-Namen GOLDFUSS in GOLDIUS latinisiert und abgekürzt ; dementsprechend hat er den Gattungs-Namen Goldius gebildet. Wollte man anfangen, " unerlaubte " Latinisierungen des Paten-Namens zu " berichtigen ", so müsste man auch den Gattungs-Namen Goldius zu Goldfussius und einen Art-Namen goldius zu goldfussius emendieren. Das ist nur ein Probefall für solche unnötigen Anderungen von Tier-Namen†.

Aber auch Tier-Namen, die *nach* 1905 aufgestellt worden sind, sollte man nicht nach Artikel 14c *nachträglich* " berichtigen ", wenn der Autor einen Paten-Namen latinisiert oder sonst in freier Weise umgebildet hat. So ist z.B. der Name des Paten QUIRING (auf dessen Wunsch) von DAHMER zu QUIRINUS latinisiert und davon nach 1905 der Name quirini abgeleitet

† Vgl. RUD. RICHTER : Schutz der Tier-Namen vor Emendation.—Senckenbergiana, *32* : 357, 1952.

worden. Wird ein Revisor wirklich den Mut haben, quirini in quiringi zu ändern und dadurch vielleicht auch noch einen älteren Namen quiringi zu erschüttern ?

Nach dem Geiste der Regeln will die philologische Vorschrift, die Artikel 14 im letzten Absatz über die Ableitung des Art-Namens von einem Paten-Namen nur eine Befreiung von dem Zwang zu einer lateinischen Deklination sein. Artikel 14 will keine Quelle nachträglicher Anderungen sein.

Wird der Artikel 14 dennoch zu einer Schädigung der Stabilität missbraucht, dann müsste das durch eine eindeutige Fassung verhütet werden, entsprechend der von grossen Gesellschaften geforderten Präambel : " Wenn eine Bestimmung der Regeln mit dem Prinzip der Stabilität in Widerspruch steht, so ist es die Pflicht der Internationalen Kommission die Anderung der betreffenden Bestimmung herbeizuführen. Denn die Namen sind wichtiger als die Nomenklatur.*

Die Pariser Beschlüsse, die obiger Antrag für gültig hält, haben in Wirklichkeit keine Gültigkeit.

* Antrag an die Internationale Kommission fur Zoologische Nomenklatur Senckenbergiana *33* : 193, 1952.

CASE NO. 16

ARTICLE 14 (OR ASSOCIATED ARTICLE) : QUESTION OF THE GENDER ATTRIBUTABLE TO GENERIC NAMES CONSISTING OF COMPOUND WORDS OF GREEK OR LATIN ORIGIN

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)440)

DOCUMENT 16/1

Introductory Note by **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The annexed correspondence is concerned with the question of the gender to be attributed to a generic name consisting of a compound word of Greek or Latin origin, a subject of importance for the purpose of complying with the provisions of the first paragraph of Article 14, on which however the *Règles* at present provide no guidance.

2. This question was raised by Dr. Reeve M. Bailey (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*) (in a letter dated 1st December, 1949) in relation to the gender to be applied to the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818, a genus comprising a large group of American cyprinid fishes. Dr. Bailey's letter is annexed as Document 16/2. The issue raised by Dr. Bailey clearly called, in the first instance, for advice from some eminent Greek scholar and I accordingly consulted Professor L. W. Grensted, D.D. (*Oriel College, Oxford*), who on previous occasions had been so good as to place his knowledge at the disposal of the International Commission. The extremely interesting and informative reply received from Professor Grensted is annexed as Document 16/3.

3. In the light of the information so received, for which the Commission is much indebted to Professor Grensted, it is possible to devise as follows a provision which wouid give an answer to the question raised by Dr. Bailey and to all similar cases when they arise :—

> The gender of generic names consisting of compound words of Greek or Latin origin is to be determined as follows :—
>
> (a) Where one of the comprised words is an adjective and the other a noun, the gender of the generic name is whatever may be the gender of the noun.

(b) Where both the comprised words are nouns and one of those nouns is a noun with verbal force, the gender of the generic name is whatever may be the gender of the noun having verbal force.

(c) Where both the comprised words are nouns and neither has a verbal force, the gender of the generic name is whatever may be the gender of the first of the two nouns concerned, save exceptionally where, as in the name *Hippopotamus*, it is evident that the first noun is primary and the second strictly adjectival.

(d) Where there are reasonable grounds for believing that the gender of a word composing a generic name cannot be correctly determined in accordance with the foregoing rules, the case should be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision.

3. In the particular case of the name *Notropis* Rafinesque, on which the present general problem was raised by Dr. Reeve Bailey, it appears from Professor Grensted's letter (1) that it is highly probable that the correct gender of the word " Notropis " is feminine, but (2) that the possibility of its being neuter or (less probably) masculine cannot be excluded. There is therefore an element of doubt in this matter which would make it possible for the International Commission to give a ruling without invoking its plenary powers. Accordingly, if it is the general wish of ichthyologists that the traditional use of the masculine gender should be continued for the name *Notropis* Rafinesque, it would be open to the International Commission, if it so thought fit, to give a ruling in this sense, the name *Notropis* Rafinesque being at the same time placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

DOCUMENT 16/2

By **REEVE M. BAILEY**

(University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.)

Letter dated 1st December, 1949

Recently there has developed a problem which, although minor, is potentially a source of much annoyance and confusion. I appeal to your experience with the International Commisssion as to the best method for handling this matter.

In 1818 Rafinesque (*Amer. Month. Mag.*, 2 : 204) established a new genus *Notropis* on the basis of a single new species, named by him *atherinoides*. This appears to be the oldest generic name for a large group of American cyprinid fishes. It has long been believed by ichthyologists that the derivation of the name *Notropis* is from *notus* (*νωτος*), masculine, the back and *tropis* (*τροπις*), feminine, keel. Following a free translation, keeled-back, the name would be masculine, but a friend who is a classicist, assures me that the terminal element (*tropis*) determines gender, and thus *Notropis* should be regarded as feminine. Several of us have been aware of this for several years but have disregarded it and have followed common practice : ichthyologists in the past, without important exception, have treated *Notropis* as masculine. Now however one of my distinguished colleagues, who is in a puristic frame of mind, proposed to revert to the classical feminine for *Notropis*. If the genus were small or insignificant this action would seem wise, but unfortunately *Notropis* is the largest genus of North American fresh-water fishes, including well over 100 species and in excess of 150 species and subspecies. Also, many of the most abundant and widely distributed of our smaller fishes are included. The terminations of dozens of names such as *cornutus*, *rubellus*, *volucellus*, *zonatus*, *bellus* and *maculatus* will have to be changed if this proposed innovation is followed.

The problem is whether (1) to make the change and treat *Notropis* as feminine forthwith, (2) to disregard the matter entirely as has been done in the past and continue to treat *Notropis* as masculine, or (3) to petition the International Commission to permit us, through plenary action, to treat *Notropis* as masculine.

As indicated above this is a minor point but the confusion attending change would further alienate taxonomists from those other biologists who deal with animal names and who long for stability.

DOCUMENT 16/3

By **L. W. GRENSTED,** D.D. (*Oriel College, Oxford*)

Letter dated 22nd December, 1949

Gender of generic names which are compound words of Greek or Latin origin

The whole business seems to me to bristle with special cases, owing to the queer compounds that have been published, but the following principles hold :—

(1) If one part of the name is an adjective, of the other a noun, no question arises. The gender of the noun obviously dominates.

(2) If one part of the name is a noun with verbal force, governing the other noun (e.g., *Melophagus*, *Limnophila*) the gender will normally be that of the noun with verbal force. But irregular formations such as *Philhydrus* would have to be considered individually. Here in fact the " *Phil-*" is not so much a noun as a verbal stem, and the whole word is a compound adjective, masculine in form.

(3) If both parts are derived from nouns which are not verbal in force (as in the case of *Notropis*), the first will, in all rightly formed names, be adjectival to the second (I know of no exception to this in Greek except *ιπποποταμος*, which is generally regarded as a monstrosity, and which may very possibly have a special explanation—since the original name of the hippopotamus was *ιππος ποταμιος* and there is evidence from a papyrus that this was sometimes contracted to *ιπποποταμις*, whence the change to *ιπποποταμος* is easy. Therefore in all rightly formed names the gender will be the gender of the second noun, and this principle should be followed wherever possible. The gender should only go with the first noun where there is indisputable evidence that it is primary and that the second noun is strictly adjectival. I cannot think of an example of this, except *Hippopotamus*, and it certainly makes for simplicity if the second noun controls the gender.

(4) Accepting the above principle *Notropis* must be feminine, and this is of course the natural gender in any case for a noun in " -is ". But the detailed analysis of the name is interesting, as follows :—

(5) I do not know whether Rafinesque gave any clue, but, assuming the usual examination of the name, all three genders are possible, feminine being far the most probable, and neuter, of the other two, more probable than masculine. The proper form of the name would, of course, have been *Nototropis*,

that does not affect the question of gender. The contraction to *Notropis* does, however, suggest that " tropis ", the one complete element, is the dominant one. The Greek words concerned are νωτον or νωτος and τροπις, the latter being feminine. The neuter νωτον is far commoner than the masculine νωτος. In the early poets and in Attic Greek the word is always neuter, and the only important passages to set against this are two in Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*, where the accusative νωτον is made to agree with a masculine adjective. The nominative νωτος seems not to be found at all. If therefore the first element in *Notropis* determines the gender it should be neuter !

(6) But there is not need to stress the first element. The name just means " back-keel " which is quite as descriptive as " keel-back ". It indicates fishes with dorsal keels, just as " red-shank " is combined to denote a bird with red legs, " ox-eye " a daisy like an ox's eye, and " thread-fin " a fish with thread-like fins. I suppose that these forms (none of which is exactly parallel to the others) are really noun-forms in apposition to a supposed subject. In the case of word *Notropis* it is perfectly natural to take the tropis or keel as the determinative element, the keel indicated having the character of being on the back of the fish. I can see no reason why the word should not follow the natural indication of its termination and be feminine.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Temporary postponement of publication of Triple Part 3/5

Technical production difficulties have led to a temporary postponement of the publication of Triple Part 3/5, which contains the series of papers received on the subject of the emendation of names. This Part, which contains pages 61–166 of the present volume, will, however, it is hoped, be published at a very early date.

Printed in England by METCALFE & COOPER LIMITED, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2